

13486*1

I hereby certify that this paper, along with any other paper or fee referred to in this paper as being transmitted herewith, is being filed electronically with the Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 3rd day of April, 2008.

By: Tom Bils

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Elmar KeBenich, et al. :
SERIAL NO.: 10/537,526 : Confirmation No.: 3587
FILED: 10/6/05 : Examiner: Joshua D. Zimmerman
FOR: PRODUCTION OF FLEXOGRAPHIC :
PRINTING PLATES FOR NEWSPAPER :
PRINTING BY MEANS OF DIGITAL :
IMAGING AND APPARATUS THEREFOR:

Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Sir:

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Office Action dated January 15, 2008. In that Office Action claims 21-27 were rejected over Knoll, et al. in view of Tsuchida, et al. and Eck et al. In the rejection the Examiner referred in detail to the various portions of Knoll et al. with regard to the individual features of parent claim 21. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the Examiner has overlooked an essential feature of the claimed invention not disclosed by Knoll et al. Specifically, as defined in claim 21, which refers to feature (B) of the apparatus, there are at least two functional units for the digital imaging of the flexographic printing element which are arranged

along a moveable bar, movable in Y-direction, and wherein each of the functional units produces an image in each case one part of the digitally imageable layer by moving the entire bar in the Y-direction and moving the bar or the imageable layer in the X-direction, the X-direction being essentially perpendicular to said U-direction.

With respect to the digital imaging unit comprising at least two functional units of the same type, the Examiner refers to Eck et al. Please note, however, that Eck et al. is not directed to an apparatus for the in-line production of flexographic printing plates, but rather to a printing device having a plurality of printing heads. Eck et al. does not disclose the specific set up of the claimed invention in feature (B) of claim 21, wherein functional units of the same type are arranged along a bar movable in a Y-direction perpendicular to the X-direction in which the imageable layer is moved. According to Figures 1 and 2 of Eck et al. printing heads (1), (4) or (3), (6) are mounted on a common print head holder (23), or (24), respectively, see [0024] of Eck et al. The printing head holder (23) or (24) are not moveable in a direction essential perpendicular to the printing direction (19), and the imageable layer (i.e. the material to be imprinted) is not imaged (imprinted) by moving the entire holder (23) or (24) in a direction essentially perpendicular to the printing direction (19). According to Eck et al. the printing heads are arranged in several

parallel rows and the print heads in different rows are offset transversely to each other and the printing direction. The individual printing heads are arranged obliquely with respect to the print direction.

Therefore claim 21 is not rendered obvious by Knoll et al. in view of Tsuchida et al. and Eck et al.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the rejection and that this application should be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

BY: 
Harold Pezzner
Reg. No. 22,112
1007 N. Orange Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 658-9141

@PFDdesktop\::ODMA/MHODMA/IMANDMS;CB;594411;1